

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 15, 20 and 25 are amended.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

Claims 14-18, 21, 23-24, 27-30, 33-34 and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett et al. 2003/0118179, 'Barnett', hereinafter in view of Wilson 2003/0114184 A1. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the amended claim 14, neither Barnett nor Wilson, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable a sheet shaped member covering at least **front surfaces** of the two housing portions **faced to each other at the bent state** of the bendable member.

Barnett does not disclose the above feature of the amended claim 14, as admitted by the examiner in the Office action which describes that Barnett does not specifically teach where the sheet shaped member covering at least the front surfaces of the two housing portions.

The Office action states that Wilson teaches the sheet shaped member covering at least front surfaces of the two housing portions (e.g., see at least figures 3 and 4a-4c). However, as clearly shown in figures 3 and 4a-4c of Wilson, no portion of the front surfaces of the two

housing portions 2, 4, which are faced to each other at the bent state of the bendable member, is covered by the resilient elongate flexible straps 30 (the alleged sheet shaped member). According to the paragraph [0024] of Wilson, a pair of resilient elongate flexible straps 30 extend over the outside of the telephone 1, each having one end 31 attached to **the outside of the cover 4** and another end 32 attached to **the rear surface of the rear casing portion 3**. This disclosure together with figures 3 and 4a-4c indicates that the resilient elongate flexible straps 30 do not cover the front surfaces of the cover 4 and the rear casing portion 3 which are faced to each other at the bended state of the bendable member, but only cover the rear surfaces of the cover 4 and the rear casing portion 3 which are not faced to each other at the bended state of the bendable member. In fact, as shown in figure 4c which shows the bent state of the bendable member, no portion of the resilient elongate flexible straps 30 covers the front surfaces of the cover 4 and the rear casing portion 3 which are faced to each other.

Accordingly, the combination of Barnett and Wilson does not meet all of the limitations of claim 14. Therefore, the asserted combination of Barnett and Wilson does not render claim 14 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 14 is respectfully requested.

Similar arguments apply to claim 15.

Claims 16, 21, 23-24, 27-29, 33 and 37 which are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 14 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 14.

Claims 17, 18, 30, 34 and 38 which are dependent from any one of claim 15 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 15.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 20, 22, 25-26, 31-32, 35-36 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Barnett et al. 2003/0118179, 'Barnett', hereinafter, in view of Holtorf et al. US Patent No.: 7,251,323, 'Holtorf', hereinafter. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the amended claim 20, neither Barnett nor Holtorf, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable a sheet shaped member covering at least **front surfaces** of the two housing portions **faced to each other at a bent state** of the bendable member.

Barnett does not disclose the above feature of the amended claim 20, as admitted by the examiner in the Office action which describes that Barnett does not specifically teach where the sheet shaped member covering at least the front surfaces of the two housing portions.

The Office action states that Holtorf teaches the sheet shaped member covering at least front surfaces of the two housing portions (e.g., see at least figures 3a and 3b). However, as clearly shown in figures 3a and 3b of Holtorf, no portion of the front surfaces of the first and second functional components 301, 302, which are faced to each other at the bent state of the bendable member 340, are covered by a sheet shaped member. Instead, as shown in figures 3a and 3b of Holtorf, the bi-stable member 310 only covers the rear surfaces of the first and second functional components 301, 302 which are not faced to each other at the bended state of the bendable member 340.

Accordingly, the combination of Barnett and Holtorf does not meet all of the limitations of claim 20. Therefore, the asserted combination of Barnett and Holtorf does not render claims 20 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 20 is respectfully requested.

Similar arguments apply to claims 22 and 25.

Claims 31, 35 and 39 which are dependent from claim 20 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 20.


Claims 26, 32, 36 and 40 which are dependent from claim 25 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 25.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-40271.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:   
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: March 29, 2011